DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 289 SP 034 024

AUTHOR Weiner, Lois
TITLE Preparing Teachers for a New Educational Paradigm: Lessons from the 1960's.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Ability; Academic Achievement; Change Agents; Educational Change; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Programs; Higher Education; *Internship Programs; *Models; Public Schools; Student Characteristics; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Educator Education
IDENTIFIERS Collaboration for Improvement of Teacher Educ; *Constituency Development; *Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

A proposed paradigm for restructuring public schools has at least two essential components: (1) schools and school personnel must recognize the strengths that students bring to school and draw on these capacities to nurture achievement; and (2) schooling should be based on collaboration among its many constituencies, including school personnel, parents, students, citizens, and higher education faculty. Two federal government programs targeted to assist disadvantaged students in the 1960s, the National Teacher Corps and Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) are cited. These projects utilized teacher preparation to reform education so that children not traditionally well served by public schools would succeed academically. The focus of the Teacher Corps was on providing an internship experience which would nurture the individual teacher's ability to prompt change within the public schools; TTT attempted to utilize schools of education to alter the relationships among teacher preparation's disparate constituencies. Analysis of the Teacher Corps and TTT allows for comparison of two different approaches to using teacher preparation to improve schooling, shows how government can institute projects which promote school reform, and demonstrates that lessons learned are applicable to teacher preparation and school reform in the 1990s across the socioeconomic spectrum. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED349289

PREPARING TEACHERS FOR A NEW EDUCATIONAL PARADIGM:

LESSONS FROM THE 1960'S

PAPER PRESENTED TO THE AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA
APRIL 1992

LOIS WEINER
DEPT. OF ADMINISTRATION, CURRICULUM, AND INSTRUCTION
JERSEY CITY STATE COLLEGE
JERSEY CITY, NEW JERSEY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L Weiner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP034024

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In preparing our papers for this symposium, David Seeley and I have agreed that the new paradigm needed to restructure public schools has at least two essential components: it must be success-oriented, in other words, schools and school people must recognize the strengths that students bring to school and draw on these capacities to nurture achievement. The second premise of the paradigm is that schooling should be based on collaboration among schooling's many constituencies, including school personnel, parents, students, citizens, and higher education faculty.

The paradigm we propose, which David Seeley has identified as "education through partnership," has also been termed a "holistic" or "ecological" perspective.1 In the past thirty years this approach has been discussed primarily as a method to improve schooling for poor, minority students, and although my paper will cite the experiences of two programs targeted to assist "disadvantaged" students in the 1960's, the lessons are applicable to teacher preparation and school reform across the socio-economic spectrum.2

The two programs I discuss in this paper, the National Teacher Corps and Trainers of Teacher Trainers, known as TTT, were projects of the Federal government and shared the same end goal, using teacher preparation to reform education so that chilldren not traditionally well served by public schools would succeed acadmeically. However, they differed sharply in their strategies for promoting change, as well as in their

organizational structure. After briefly tracing and comparing their development I will suggest how their histories can inform our thinking about preparing teachers who can lead school change and who are capable of working collaboratively with all of schooling's constituencies.

Both the National Teacher Corps and Trainers of Teacher Trainers merit close examination for several reasons. First, unlike projects developed by individual schools, Trainers of Teacher Trainers, or TTT as it was generally called, and the Teacher Corps each had dozens of national sites. They faced the organizational challenge of encouraging creative solutions while enforcing standards of achievement, of duplicating successful ideas while protecting against institutionalization of rigid formulas.

Other characteristics also make the Teacher Corps merit special attention. The program's size and scope were considerable. Between 1965 and 1975, the Teacher Corps prepared about 11,000 people to teach.3 Programs were located in urban areas, rural Appalachia, Indian reservations, and sites with migrant and Spanish-speaking populations, and were organized with participation by universities and school systems. The Teacher Corps tested, on a national scale, the hypothesis that an internship model of teacher preparation could serve as a mechanism for improving education for the disadvantaged.4 The initial, "unarticulated expectation that the young might bring freshness and vigor" to public education 5 became an explicit

commitment to produce Teacher Corps interns who would be "change agents," introducing curricular innovation to public schools.6

Like the Teacher Corps, part of TTT's importance inheres in the bredth of the program, in 57 sites in 1970.7 TTT's philosophy was improvement of education for the disadvantaged through concentrating attention on teacher education personnel themselves, who would in turn improve the quality of teacher preparation programs and the teachers of disadvantaged students. TTT programs retained teacher preparation's traditional base within college but emphasized institutional change within schools of education to encourage them to share responsibility or "parity" for teacher education with liberal arts faculty, local public schools, and community representives.8 While TTT and the Teacher Corps shared a concern about the relevance of teachers' academic prepration and both experimented with more field-based coursework, the Teacher Corps focused on providing an internship experience which would nurture the individual teacher's ability to prompt change within the public schools. In contrast, TTT attempted to utilize schools of education to alter the relationships among teacher preparation's disparate constituencies, one of which was the public schools, and in so doing to improve teacher preparation and schooling for poor, minority students. Thus, analysis of the Teacher Corps and TTT allows comparison of two different approaches to using teacher preparation to improve schooling.

THE TEACHER CORPS

The Teacher Corps developed in part from the Cardozo Peace Corps Program, which recruited returning Peace Corps volunteers to staff Cardozo High School in Washington, D.C.9 The Cardozo Project in Urban Teaching, as it was called in the principal's 1964 report, attempted to develop an "intellectual approach to the day-to-day problems of teaching."10 The project originally had two purposes: to develop effective curricula for school use and to provide teacher training that would "produce teachers who can make the urban classroom a catalyst for those economic, social and intellectual changes which are needed if the public high school is to fulfill its role as a key long-range agent in combatting juvenile delinquency and encouraging youth opportunities."11

The traditional teacher preparation program, six months of study followed by six months of teaching, was replaced by an internship model in which participants taught two full classes and attended after-school seminars for coursework leading to certification. Master teachers were hired to teach two classes, supervise the interns, and participate in the after-school seminars taught by professors from nearby colleges and attended by interns and a few regular teachers who were relieved of one of their high school classes. The principal noted that the project engendered some hostility from the school staff, who felt isolated and unutilized but that strained relations were ameliorated somewhat by the reduction in the faculty's normal class sizes which resulted from interns teaching two classes.

Still, regular faculty chafed at their exclusion from interns' after-school seminars and the project's failure to assign interns extra duties, like lunch room patrol, which the rest of the faculty were given. Interns received similar assignments in the second cycle and regular faculty members were invited to participate in subject matter courses for interns, which were relocated from Howard University to the school.12

The overwhelmingly positive evaluation of the initial project prompted its expansion, and recruitment was broadened to include interns who were not returned Peace Corps volunteers. However, a subsequent report on the Cardozo project, renamed the Urban Teacher Corps, showed important conceptual differences.13 For one, an explicit pedagogical philosophy had been adopted: the program now eschewed the "teacher-dominated, text-oriented, student recitation type" of classroom because it did not meet the needs of inner-city youngsters.14 In addition, the principal's 1964 report stated the program's commitment to produce teachers who would make the classroom a catalyst for broad social and economic change, but it included no negative assessment of the Cardozo faculty or urban teachers generally. The 1968 description of the Urban Teacher Corps outlined a more circumspect goal, attracting and training teachers, but pegged the program's value to the inadequacies of most urban teachers, "ineffective, unconcerned, and ill-prepared persons occupying space in classrooms."15 In this latter report, the faculty at Cardozo High School, and by implication teachers in most urban high schools,

ranged from "a core of dedicated, well-qualified teachers down to the usual number of time-servers."16

By 1966 the original program had been replicated in other locations. The programs were funded on two year cycles, with participation by universities and school systems. Over 750 interns had been graduated and another 900 were completing their final year. Interns enrolled for two years of training and teaching, with steadily increasing teaching responsibility.17 No entirely "typical" program existed since all were local creations which changed over their first decade of existence. However, most programs had 33 interns, with the team leaders, (the position called "master teacher" in the original project), selected by the principal. The program coordinator was usually a school district employee.18

In a special issue of the Journal of Teacher Education reporting on the Teacher Corps, two authors identified its goals: to improve educational opportunity for children of the poor, to induct into the teaching establishment a college graduate committed to reform, and to influence university-based teacher education to become more field-oriented.19 Senator Gaylord Nelson, who had sponsored the legislation creating the Teacher Corps, described approximately the same objectives: the Teacher Corps was to capture "the idealism and enthusiasm of youth," as the Peace Corps had done, and "to provide quality education for low-income and minority children" by bringing school and university together in teacher education.20

These general goals were expressed in Teacher Corps programs in three ways. First, teacher training was considered the vehicle for improving urban education. Second, Teacher Corps interns and graduates were expected as individuals to improve urban education, primarily through curriculum innovations. Finally, much of the course work for certification was conducted at the school rather than the college, and "team leaders" at the school sites supervised the practice teaching.

Though the general goals of the Teacher Corps might have been clear, a former director observed that the program never had either a psychology or philosophy of education, aside from training interns as change agents who were "going to straighten things out."21 Its decentralized organization, as well as sharp disagreements among teacher educators as to appropriate methods of teacher preparation, deterred development of a uniform pedagogical approach. For example, a 1968 evaluation, issued after the first group of interns had been graduated nationally, argued that local programs had to define their criteria for "acceptable teacher preparation in observable or measurable terms" since there were "legitimately conficting views on the behaviors that constitute competent or effective teaching in different environments or situations."22 The Teacher Corps' national administration attempted to develop project specifications which would "mesh theory and reality into an integrated, data-dependent, field-based program" in each Teacher Corps project.23 But this demand for a uniform model of teacher

training was resisted by local projects which argued that standardization led to "oppressive stereotypes" about students and "simple single-minded solutions."24

Interns encouraged to be "change agents" and project personnel clashed with regular school staff and "were frequently rejected."25 The friction between Teacher Corps interns and regular school staff in many Teacher Corps sites mirrored the larger conflict between the Teacher Corps, universities, and school systems. The educational establishment initially expressed reservations about the Teacher Corps bringing interns, who were untrained, into teaching and inviting federal involvement in education, previously the domain of state and local government. In response, Congress amended eligibility requirements and control of intern selection, requiring school systems and cooperating universities to authorize Teacher Corps proposals.26

TRAINERS OF TEACHER TRAINERS

Trainers of Teacher Trainers was funded as part of the 1967 Education Professions Development Act. Whether the first "T" in the program title stood for "Trainers" or "Training" was never clear, but the program's focus was understood to be directed to teacher education personnel themselves, and thus indirectly to the teacher candidates they trained. TTT emphasized institutional change within teacher preparation programs, to provide better service to populations least well-served in the past. The concept

of developing "parity" in teacher preparation, which was defined as the participation of schools of education, liberal arts colleges, public schools and communities in planning and conducting the teacher education program, was one of TTT's central ideas.27

By including liberal arts colleges and faculty as partners in reform of teacher preparation, TTT's principle of "parity" implied that teacher education's flaws were knotted up with defects in higher education as a whole. This theoretical underpinning was articulated in a conference "The Year of the Liberal Arts" organized by the West Coast and Southwest clusters of TTT to discuss what liberal arts colleges could do to serve the education of teachers and to improve teaching. In all, forty-three TTT projects participated, representing four regional groupings.28 In his introduction to the published version of the conference proceedings, Don Davies argued that "both higher and 'lower' education continue to poison each other's wells; in fact, it turns to be a common well." Improving elementary and secondary education required reform of higher education, and neither could succeed without genuine participation by the community, which is the interested and main consumer of education, he continued.29

TTT had a far shorter life-span than the Teacher Corps. Created as part of the Education Professions Development Act of 1967, TTT had its federal funding eliminated by 1973.30 However, in its brief existence it developed a range of programs so wide that their content and organizational form resist summary. For

example, in addition to four different programs at CUNY, Indiana TTT, based at Indiana University in Bloomington sponsored an "Urban College Weekend" for school personnel, community members, liberal arts faculty, students, and teacher education faculty. The experience included observation at public schools and immersion in problems and concerns of inner-city life, including visits to bars, court, homes of families living on welfare, and a political rally. Indiana TTT also instituted an "Urban Semester Program" for students interested in urban schools, placing students ready to begin their practice teaching in schools for half the semester and in various social service agencies for the other half.31

Michigan State University and Lansing School District attempted to create a new pattern of student teaching in the graduate program as part of their TTT project. The university developed "clinic teams" on subject matter lines (Humanities, Social Science, Natural Science), with two faculty from each discipline, a public school teacher, and three experienced teachers serving as fellows. In addition, TTT attempted to stimulate both graduate and undergraduate programs of inner city education that would work with community members to produce materials for teaching.

According to a brochure published by the TTT project of Michigan State University and the Lansing School District, TTT nationally contained 57 sites which differed in their approach but were all aimed at "in-service development of teacher

trainers."32 Since each project translated the goal of "parity" into a different programmatic form, no summary presentation of TTT programs is possible, but comparing four co-extant TTT projects of City University of New York illuminates the variation in TTT sites, as well as conceptual similarities.

TTT at City University of New York, the major trainer of new teachers for New York City, had projects at Hunter, Brooklyn, City, and Richmond Colleges. Each was managed by an advisory board composed of education faculty, liberal arts faculty, public school representatives, students, and community representatives, reflecting the concern with "parity." CUNY's TTT stressed making both the faculty and students, undergraduates enrolled in the teacher training program, into teachers and learners, arguing that the real trainers of teachers were people at all levels of education, from elementary pupils to college faculty.33

Faculty of Hunter TTT made curriculum planning their focus, involving representatives from the Hunter student body, community, and Harlem public schools. They decided whenever possible to teach liberal arts courses concurrently with related educational methods courses. All TTT students studied Spanish for one year, unless they were already fluent in a language indigenous to an inner-city population. The underlying educational philosophy of the project was promoting open classrooms in city schools. Hunter's focused on developing field-based training, with education courses held at the practice teaching sites. Liberal arts instruction continued at the Hunter

campus. Hunter TTT participants understood "parity" to mean "maximum responsiveness to input by TTT students and minimum responsiveness to community input."34

Vivian Windley served as TTT project director at City College. The program aimed to improve elementary education in Harlem schools directly, but through this to effect changes in teacher education within the City College program. "Parity" was attempted by the extensive use of community people as volunteers in open classrooms and the training of para-professionals. Also, liberal arts faculty were recruited as "consultants" from City College to teach public school classes directly and in so doing assist in the inservice aspects of the program. For instance, one sociology professor taught a class on the functions of families to first graders, posing a research question for them about their their own family. (An evaluation of the lesson noted that the instructor's approach contradicted fundamentals of the open classroom approach which stressed students' demonstrated readiness for an experience.) TTT developed a lab for open education that project participants hoped would be exported, although Windley stressed that not all teachers could or should use open education, and that the approach could not succeed without thoroughly prepared teachers, as well as support from school and community. Student teachers in the TTT project were supervised by "clinical instructors," public school teachers trained by City College.35

TTT at Richmond College in Staten Island disintegrated

shortly after it began. In his resignation, the program director noted that the project guidelines, to identify groups of change agents among the professors of teacher education, professors of liberal arts, public school teachers, parents, community representatives, and college students, had been too vague. Another problem cited in analysis of the defunct program was hostility between school staff and community members on one side and TTT "change agents" on the other. Furthermore, although 60% of the Richmond College graduates entered teaching, the liberal arts faculty were skeptical about students' career orientations and the college's career-oriented programs, like teacher preparation.36

Brooklyn College TTT created a pilot program to transfer teacher training to the public school in what it termed a "field-centered training model." The program coincided with the major focus of the Brooklyn College teacher education department, which had made the entire senior year of the undergraduate program field-based. While the project cited as a major goal increased participation of public school staff, parents, liberal arts faculty, and community members in teacher education, evaluators reported that it didn't meet TTT requirements to have public school personnel, students, and community members educate the teacher trainers. The project's funds were cut and the project director resigned.37

EVALUATING TTT AND THE TEACHER CORPS

Comparing the Teacher Corps and TTT is problematic for

several reasons. Perhaps most importantly, during the period both were in operation, educators developed no consensus over the fundamental question of whether urban teachers of disadvantaged students required special preparation. Even advocates of specialized preparation of urban teachers differed as to the essential content of such preparation since they disagreed about the reasons for students' academic failure.38 However, the programs can be judged by their success in accomplishing their respective goals.

Another complication is judging the reliability of the techniques used to assess the programs. Program participants did not always complete questions on evaluation forms if they found them to be irrelevant.39 However, this limitation should not by itself discredit the evaluations because especially in TTT's case, assessments relied heavily on site visits and interviews. For example, an early study of 40 TTT sites had inspection teams of four people, each member a representative of one of the four groups which were to share "parity" visit and interview participants.40 Two prominent participants in TTT and the Teacher Corps have confirmed that my assessment, synthesized from reports, does indeed correspond to their recollection.41

Almost all of the literature on the "change agent" strategy of Teacher Corps projects observed that interns made ineffective "change agents."42 Teacher Corps interns trained to be "change agents" tended to regard "any limitations on their actions to be denials" of their role and "overreact to even reasonable

organizational restraints."43 A summary of data about ten Teacher Corps projects in 1969-1970 concluded that using interns as "change agents" created discordance in schools,44 perhaps because interns were "not infrequently disrespectful of authority, resentful of tradition, impatient with compromise."45 A non-technical summary of data collected on ten Teacher Corps programs in 1969 - 1970 observed, "No matter how well-trained the interns or the teachers, it seems unrealistic to hold them responsible for leading school reform while they face the day-to-day, time-consuming tasks and the constraints of their jobs."46 A director of the national Teacher Corps confirmed this critique when he observed that interns thought they were "going to straighten things out, but it turned out to be a lot tougher than they imagined. Those who had been in the Peace Corps...thought it was tougher here by far."47

A study which compared graduates of two programs, one of them the Teacher Corps, designed to produce teachers capable of acting as change agents, found that neither "change agent" group had a greater demand for autonomy than a control group of traditionally-trained teachers but that "change agents" had a lower sense of power. (This result echoes charges that M.A.T. programs which shared a "change agent" orientation also encouraged an elitist disregard for traditionally-trained teachers and areas of shared concern.)48 The Teacher Corps counterposed the "freshness and vigor" that the young interns would bring into schools to inadequacies of older, experienced

staff.49 In so doing, the Teacher Corps projects did not encourage and probably diminished interns' receptivity to perceiving problems and experiences they shared with veteran teachers. Their high expectations may have fused with a sense of isolation from veteran teachers to create a greater sense of powerlessness.

Gaylord Nelson termed the Teacher Corps "effective and successful" in bringing school and university together in teacher education, but the report of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development gave a more complicated and critical assessment of the Teacher Corps role. Basing its conclusions on nine studies, the Council noted that institutions of higher education had isolated the Teacher Corps programs and made little change in their teacher training curricula; project success depended on the managerial abilities of project participants and their previous organizational relationships; the more local school districts were involved in training decisions, the less innovation occurred in the classroom. Edelfelt, Corwin, and Hanna also noted tensions between school and university. School districts tended to neglect the Teacher Corps mission of change to give teachers relief: teachers wanted interns to be assistants but interns wanted to be change agents. In addition, interns were frequently dissatisfied with the university teaching.50

One evaluation concluded that the Teacher Corps succeeded in changing curriculum, but only in classrooms of Teacher Corps

graduates, and that student-teacher interaction was not changed. This finding confirmed that teacher education could influence curriculum, which was a primary goal of the Teacher Corps and a valuable one. However, its broader aim of reforming urban schools themselves was unfulfilled. Indeed, the "change agent" strategy undercut this goal, for in assuming that individual teachers could be catalysts for school-wide change, it ignored the institutional pressures which caused veteran teachers to perform as they did. Thus, even the young, energetic, idealistic teachers trained by the Teacher Corps were unable to fundamentally alter what their schools taught or how teachers could relate to their students.

The U.S. Office of Education conducted a study of sixth cycle Teacher Corps graduates, comparing them with other teachers of grades two through six in the same district. Teacher Corps graduates were superior in developing ethnically relevant curricula, using community resources and initiating parental contact, but there were no differences in the degree of attention given pupil behavior problems or their affective tone in the classroom. In addition, no differences in students' reading achievement were measured although students of Teacher Corps graduates did score significantly higher on a self-concept scale.51 Here again, the success of the program was in recruiting and training teachers who could shape instructional content to their students' needs and desires, but individual teachers, no matter how well they accomplished their curricular tasks, could

not obviate institutional pressures to deal with students in a custodial fashion. Nor could their curricular improvements boost student scores on standardized reading tests, which was another indication that factors beyond the individual teacher's performance had to be considered in designing teacher education programs that would improve students' academic success.

Ironically, two issues identified as problems for the Teacher Corps were aspects of TTT's raison d'etre. TTT's focus on institutionalization of change addressed the difficulties Teacher Corps projects suffered when they remained isolated within universities, facing sharp resistance to their efforts to reform teacher education curricula.52 Also, Teacher Corps project directors learned through painful experience that they had to share power over preparing teachers with school personnel and community groups, and that collaboration had both political and operational levels which were quite different.53 For instance, early Teacher Corps projects invited parents and community agencies to vote on the competency of interns, a task which community members asked the professional educators to assume -- or leave them out of the project entirely. The idea of "parity," encouraging participation of all education's constituencies in teacher preparation, was a TTT goal from its inception.

The Teacher Corps experience raised "serious questions about whether teacher education can serve as an effective mechanism for educational reform."54 TTT's experience suggested otherwise. TTT's goal, reform of teacher preparation through the

institutional involvement of students, commmunity, school personnel, and liberal arts faculty, was ostensibly less ambitious than the Teacher Corps objective, sparking systemic change in education for the disadvantaged by attracting and training a "different breed" of teacher. However, TTT's focus seems to have fostered a capacity for systemic reform which the "change agent" concept discouraged. TTT's explicit commitment to developing positive, functioning relationships between all of teacher education's constituencies contradicted the Teacher Corps' conception of the individual teacher's ability to reform schooling.

Sites in both TTT and the Teacher Corps frequently stressed the importance of prospective teachers becoming familiar with the culture and community of their students. Both programs disavowed the idea that the culture of disadvantaged students made them, their families, or their communities "incompetent" and implicitly focused on improving the teacher's ability to link schooling to the child's existence outside the school walls. But these explicit aims of the Teacher Corps were contradicted by its emphasis on the special contribution the "new breed" of teacher could make because its focus on the individual teacher's abilities belied the importance of institutional factors.

Although the literature on TTT does not explore this distinction, it appears that TTT applied an <u>institutional</u> solution, a change in the power relations among teacher education's constituencies, to what was an <u>institutional</u> defect,

that is, the failure of urban schools and school systems to adapt to the educational requirements of disadvantaged students. For this reason, when the principle of "parity" was adhered to, TTT seems to have been successful in developing teacher preparation programs that encouraged innovative teaching techniques that would not otherwise have been accepted by parents and community members.

TTT's principle of "parity" in effect expressed the importance of the relationship between education's constituencies. David Reissman and James Comer have identified the relationships between home, family, student, and school as essential to successful education. TTT added higher education and teacher education to the list, supplementing the conceptual purview of Comer and Reissman's work and reinforcing the idea that substantial improvement in the education of disadvantaged youth depended on cooperation, trust, and respect among students, educators, teacher educators, parents, and citizens.

CONCLUSIONS

What does my analysis of the National Teacher Corps and TTT suggest about preparing teachers for schools which are paradigmatically different from those which operate today and about preparing teachers to assist schools to shift from the old service delivery model to a new paradigm?

First, it shows how the government, federal, state, and local, can institute projects which promote "ecological" school reform. With

TTT, the federal government succeeded in creating a program which formulated an educational vision which was clear enough to permit evaluation --and disqualification --of specific sites, yet general enough to encourage diversity and innovation. In contrast, attempting to replicate the success of its original project at Cardozo High School, the Teacher Corps maintained the Cardozo site's organizational components, but lost the sensitivity to local school conditions which made the initial project successful.

By encouraging local personnel to implement TTT's commitment to "parity" as they thought best, TTT generated a variety of thoughtful models to share "parity." TTT's formula seems to have effectively addressed the problem of replicating successful projects by replacing the quest for "one best system" of urban teacher preparation with a quest for multiple solutions. TTT projects failed, as they did at Richmond and Brooklyn College, when local personnel did not understand or were not committed to TTT principles. This raises another organizational problem which TTT did not address, but we must: How can institutional reform be implemented when local personnel feel no desire to change? Many of the projects in TTT sites could be replicated today, with only the slightest tinkering. Nonetheless, I think TTT's most important legacy lies not so much in the specific projects that were created under its umbrella but in the organizational strategy it adopted and in its commitment to "parity."

"Parity" suggested that school reform was an institutional

problem which required an institutional solution. "Parity" gave schools and colleges of education responsibility for establishing different kinds of relationships with parents, students, citizens, and liberal arts faculty. In creating programs which directly involved community agencies, parents, liberal arts professors, and teacher candidates themselves in teacher preparation, TTT sites modeled the permeability in institutional borders which is essential for a new paradigm of school organization. Prospective teachers enrolled in TTT programs learned first-hand the value of involving parents in planning open classrooms and the dire need for schools and social service agencies to coordiante their work. Rather than being told in foundations courses about the value of parental participation or learning in methods courses about making schooling relevant to students' life experiences, TTT's teacher candidates learned these essential components of a "holistic" approach by participating in projects which demonstrated their value. Thus, teacher candidates who were themselves products of schools based on the service delivery model were given the opportunity in their preparation to teach to experience the difference between the two paradigms.

TTT's idea of "parity" holds for programs which prepare school administrators as well. Programs which aim to educate prospective school administrators to share authority with teachers should model that cooperation with liberal arts and teacher preparation faculty. The institutional barriers dividing

educators who prepare teachers and administrators are considerable, but they are no more difficult to overcome than the barriers which those who prepare school administrators for a new paradigm ask their students to scale.

In his essay "The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education," John Dewey argued that prospective teachers' conscious understanding of their experiences as learners is the key to developing their ability to use theory and practice to inform one another. By insisting that project sites establish "parity" with other constituencies, TTT encouraged programs which provided "ecological" or "holistic" educational experiences to teacher candidates. Without access to this first-hand experience, teachers who have been taught the theoretical necessity for creating schools with permeable boundaries will have greater difficulty in developing a personal vision of how they and their schools can function differently.

Teacher preparation must educate teachers who can function in schools as they are, but prospective teachers must be given the opportunity to experience the rich possibilities for schooling when it is a collaborative venture which draws on strengths of families and communities, as well as the liberal arts faculty within colleges and universities. Without such experiences to draw upon, most teachers will be unable to imagine what schooling would be, could be, or should be, in different circumstances. Without that vision they will be unable to collaborate in shifting schools to a new paradigm.

1.David S. Seeley, "Educational Partnerships and the Dilemmas of School Reform," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (February 1984), 383-388; James P. Comer, "Black Education: A Holistic View," The Urban Review 8 (Fall 1975), 162-170; Don Davies, "Looking for an Ecological Solution. Planning to Improve the Education of Disadvantaged Children," Equity and Choice 4 (Fall 1987), 3-7.

2.Ann Bastian, Norman Fruchter, Marilyn Gittell, Colin Greer, and Kenneth Haskins, Choosing Equality. The Case for Democratic Schooling (Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press, 1986).

3. Gaylord Nelson, guest editorial, Journal of Teacher Education 26 (Summer 1975).

4. James P. Steffensen, "Teacher Corps: A Nervous Decade of Educational Innovation," Journal of Teacher Education 26 (Summer 1975): 110.

5.Terrence H. Bell, "The Progress of the Teacher Corps," Journal of Teacher Education 26 (Summer, 1975): 99.

6.F. Herbert Hite and William H. Drummond, "The Teacher Corps and Collaboration," Journal of Teacher Education 26 (Summer 1975).

7. William B. Hawley and Joseph T. Vallanti, "Trainers of Teacher Trainers" (E. Lansing: United States Office of Education, OEG# 0-9-324146-2165-721, ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 043 593, 1970).

8. Hawley and Vallanti, "Trainers of Teachers of Teachers"; Gerald R. Smith et al., "Stirrings in Teacher Education" (Bloomington, IN: Indiana TTT, 1974).

9.Roy A. Edelfelt, Ronald Corwin, and Elizabeth Hanna, Lessons from the Teacher Corps (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1974).

10. Bennetta B. Washington, "Cardozo Project in Urban Teaching: A Pilot Project in Curriculum Development Utilizing Returned Peace Corps Volunteers in an Urban High School" (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 001 653, 1964): 5.

11. Ibid., introduction.

12. Ibid.

13. Washington, D.C. Public Schools, "The Urban Teacher Corps, 1963-1968. Description and Philosophy," May 1968 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 029 854).

14. Ibid., 3.

15. Ibid., 3.

16. Ibid., 4.

17. Washington School of Psychiatry, "Teacher Corps - Two Years of Progress and Plans for the Future" (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 038 350, 1968).

18. National Addvisory Council on Education Professions Development, Teacher Corps: Past or Prologue? (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 109 083, 1975).

19. Hite and Drummond, "The Teacher Corps and Collaboration."

20. Nelson, Journal of Teacher Education editorial, 98.

21.Interview with Richard Graham, "The Teacher Corps Concept: A Journal Interview," Journal of Teacher Education 26 (Summer 1975): 113.

22. Washington School of Psychiatry, "Teacher Corps," 38.

23. Steffensen, "Teacher Corps," 110.

24. Edelfelt, Corwin, and Hanna, Lessons from the Teacher Corps, 11.

25. Hite and Drummond, "The Teacher Corps and Collaboration," 133.

26. National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, Teacher Corps: Past or Prologue? (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 109 083, 1975).

27. Smith et al., "Stirrings in Teacher Education."

28.Donald N. Bigelow, ed., The Liberal Arts and Teacher Education (Lincoln, NE: Univ. of Nebraska Press, 1971).

29. Don Davies in Donald N. Bigelow, ed., The Liberal Arts and Teacher Education, xi.

30. Evaluation Research Center, "Trainers of Teacher Trainers, vol. II, In-Depth Study: City University of New York," (University of Virginia, 1973).

31. Smith et al., "Stirrings in Teacher Education."

32. Hawley and Vallanti, "Trainers of Teachers of Teachers."

33. Evaluation Research Center, "Trainers of Teacher Trainers, vol. II, In-Depth Study: City University of New York," (University of Virginia, 1973).

34. Ibid., 45.

35. Evaluation Research Center, "Trainers of Teacher Trainers."

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid.

38.I explore this issue at length in "Perspectives on Preparing Teachers of At Risk Students in Urban Schools, 1960-1990," Ed.D. diss., Harvard Univ., 1973, Chapter 1.

39. Vito Perrone, interview with author, 7 December 1989.

40. Walter H. Crockett et al., "Report on TTT Site Visits Conducted in November and December, 1969. An Overview" (ED 043 597, not available from EDRS.)

41. Vito Perrone, in an interview with the author 7 December 1989, noted that the assessment was historically correct although lacking the narrative element which would amplify it. Larry Cuban, who was a member of the President's Advisory Council on the National Teacher Corps, also confirmed in a letter to the author, dated 18 December 1989, that the assessment given here corresponds to the advice the Council gave to Richard Graham, then Director of the National Teacher Corps.

42. National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, Teacher Corps: Past or Prologue.

43.Delbart K. Clear and Donald E. Edgar, "Training Change Agents in the Public School Context" (Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, March 1970. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 039 178), 45.

44. Edelfelt, Corwin, and Hanna, Lessons from the Teacher Corps.

45. Alfred A. Arth and Jennings L. Wagoner, Jr., "Teacher Corps Interns: A Different Breed," Educational Leadership 26 (May 1969): 801.

46. Edelfelt, Corwin, and Hanna, Lessons from the Teacher Corps, 12.

47. Graham, "The Teacher Corps Concept,"113.

48. Clear and Edgar, "Training Change Agents in the Public School Context"; Dunne, "Survival of the Innovative Teacher."

49. Bell, "The Progress of the Teacher Corps," 99.

50. Nelson, editorial in Journal of Teacher Education, 99; National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, Teacher Corps: Past or Prologue; Edelfelt, Corwin, and Hanna, Lessons from the Teacher Corps.

51. David Marsh, "An Evaluation of Sixth Cycle Teacher Corps Graduates," Journal of Teacher Education 26 (Summer 1975).

52. National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, Teacher Corps: Past or Prologue.

53. Hite and Drummond, "The Teacher Corps and Collaboration."

54. Edelfelt, Corwin, and Hanna, Lessons from the Teacher Corps, 13.